

M3U4  
M280.1  
P945  
no. 7

# PROPHETIC CONTROVERSY NO. 7

LYONS, WIS., DEC. 22, 1906.

MR. R. B. NEAL:

Dear Sir: I will now answer Prof. J. B. Grubbs remarks upon my letter to you entitled, "Prophetic Controversy No. 6" of the 9th of June last. I would have done so much sooner but could not for reasons given you by card a few days ago.

The professor seems to be quite confident that I have contradicted myself by asserting that our Mormon faith is identical with the primitive Christian faith in every point, and then again asserting that "the doctrine that Christ had no human father, is an old fable." After a few remarks on this supposed contradiction, we will enter immediately upon the question as to whether Jesus had a human father or not. One of the principles of our faith proclaimed some seventy years ago is, "We believe that the Bible is the word of God so far as it is correctly translated." Many have sneered at this, as though it were sacrilege to even question the correctness of the King James translation of the Bible, but look at the many other translations and revisions that have been made of the New Testament and parts thereof into English even since that of King James was made. At least some twenty, showing that many learned men are dissatisfied with the King James version as well as we. It is said by the learned, that there are now some seven hundred different manuscripts of the New Testament, all having come to light at different periods and in different countries during the last fourteen hundred

years. These all differ more or less, one with the other, and many of them lack much which others contain. So it is said that among all these there are many thousand different readings, so that it is a real wonder how the New Testament, especially, has come down to us as well preserved as it is, yet it is far from being correct in many things.

But the Professor asks the question: "If the New Testament is derived from such a 'chaos' of 'clashing manuscripts,' how can this ignoramous (meaning me) say that his faith is identical with the Primitive Christian, or Apostolic faith, or that it sets forth 'the same principles taught in the New Testament?'"

Let me say to the professor that calling names is, at best, but a very weak and cheap kind of argument. It doesn't enlighten an opponent, nor anyone else, worth a straw. Our answer to this question is, "We are not depending merely upon the learning and traditions of men to point out to us what is Primitive Christian and Apostolic doctrine. We have, we trust, a much safer criterion. We have the Book of Mormon, the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and an Inspired Translation of the Bible. This latter in many instances shows us that the King James version of the scriptures is not translated correctly and it does not stand alone in this; for many learned men, and the scriptures themselves, bear witness to this fact."

The professor perhaps may imagine that Joseph Smith in translating the

Bible has plowed right through and cut up, twisted and distorted the scriptures out of all shape, in order to make them conform to and harmonize with "that awful Mormon faith." But Professor Grubbs, and all others, may make themselves very easy on that matter, for the Inspired translation by Joseph Smith, does not contradict the King James, *only when the King James contradicts itself!* And whatsoever Joseph Smith has added to give light on any dark or obscure passage, it harmonizes with all other parts of the Scriptures. There is no conflict beyond this.

I will now give you some of the leading points of Mr. Strang's argument against the doctrine that Jesus, the anointed, was without human father. Mr. Strang first notices the following teaching of the old mother church on that head, contained in the "Poor Man's Catechism," as follows:

"How was he (Jesus) conceived?"  
 "Ans. *Not by human generation*, but by the power and virtue of the Holy Ghost. When was he conceived?  
 Ans. At the moment the virgin Mary gave her consent, saying: 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done unto me according to thy word.'"

"Instruction.—The conception of our blessed Saviour was purely a work of God, beyond our comprehension. It was all miraculous, full of mystery, far different from the ordinary conception of other men, *by human generation*. His conception was the immediate work of the Holy Ghost, and NOT OF ANY MAN. That his body was formed by the substance of his mother, is indeed a natural thing, for all men are in like manner formed; but that a virgin, who never knew man, should conceive a son: that his human nature should subsist in a divine person; that his mother remaining a virgin, was al-

so a mother of God, and mother of man, are mysteries beyond the reach of the nature and capacity of our understanding, and peculiar to *none but himself.*"

"Now," says Mr. Strang, "If this be true, Christ was not of the lineage of David. Jewish genealogies are always reckoned in the male line, never in the female. Moreover if we should reckon in the female line, we have not one iota of evidence that Mary, the mother of Jesus Christ, was of the lineage of David, nor even of the tribe of Judah. Two of the Evangelists, Matthew and Luke, have given the genealogy from Abraham to *Joseph*, the HUSBAND of *Mary*, for the especial purpose of showing that in the MALE LINE, Jesus Christ was a literal descendant of *Abraham, Judah and David*. If the husband of Mary was not the father of Christ, what have we to do with HIS genealogy? And for what purpose was it written? Matthew begins his gospel, 'The Book of the generation (genealogy) of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham,' and concludes the genealogy, ver. 16, 'and Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.' Why is this, if Joseph did not beget Jesus? How is this *his* genealogy, if Joseph is not his father? How is it evident as Paul says, 'that our Lord sprung out of Judah,' Heb. 7:14, if it does not appear by these genealogies, neither of which runs to Mary, but both to Joseph? Ah! would Paul dare thus in writing to the Jews, boldly assert that Christ was of the tribe of Judah, if the doctrine had then gone forth that Joseph was not his father? Aye; would not the Jews have answered: *How is it evident* that he came out of Judah? Wherein does it appear? By what line did he descend from Judah?" So far, Mr. Strang.

Now the foundation upon which the birth of Jesus rests, and is proved, is by the *oath of God to David*, as is unanimously declared by the writers of the New Testament. Peter speaking of this matter to the house of Israel on the day of Pentecost, says: "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn to him (David) *by an oath* that of the fruit of HIS loins, according the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on HIS throne, he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ that his soul was not left in hell," &c. (Acts 2:29 to 31.) When God swears by an oath, what he will do or will not do, He can no more depart from that oath, than the sun can depart out of the heavens. It is therefore the end of controversy, in all such cases.

"Of this man (David's) seed hath God, according to his promise, (his oath) raised unto Israel a Saviour Jesus." (Acts 13:23.)

"Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David." "I will also make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth." (Ps. 89:27, 35.)

"Concerning his son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of THE SEED OF DAVID according to the flesh." (Rom. 1:3.)

"Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel." (2d Tim. 2:8.)

"I am the root and the offspring of David and the bright and morning star." (Rev. 17:16.)

"Phillip findeth Nathaniel, and saith unto him: We have found him of whom Moses in the Law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth the Son of Joseph." (John 1:45.)

"Son, Why hast thou thus death with us? Thy father and I have

sought thee sorrowing." (Luke 2:48.)

"And Joseph went up from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, (because he was of the house and lineage of David.)" (Luke 2:4.)

"And they said, Is not this Jesus whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith I came down from heaven?" (John 6:42.)

"While the Pharisees were gathered together Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him the son of David. He saith unto them, How then doeth David in spirit call him Lord? saying, the Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool?" (Math. 21:41 to 45.)

The angel who visited Mary and promised her that she should give birth to the Messiah, told her also that the "Lord God shall give unto him, the throne of his father David." (Luke 1:32.)

Now then what more is necessary to show that Joseph, the husband of Mary, was of the house and lineage of David, in which lineage the Messiah was promised by the decree and the oath of God to come? Ah, now say some, you don't mean to say that the great redeemer Jesus was born into this world by the agency of man and woman, like all other human beings? That is precisely not what we Mormons say about it, but precisely what the prophets of God, the oath of God, the testimony of angels and apostles, the testimony of his own mother according to the flesh; and he, Jesus himself, and all concerned in his day, say about it. And that is precisely what we argue and contend for; and we boldly say that if the Messiahship of Jesus has not come through Joseph, the husband of Mary, there is a full

end to his claim to the Messiahship; for from no other source could that Messiahship come to any one, for it is promised in *no other lineage!* The advocates of a fatherless Messiah are evidently oppressed with their own theory.

The Reorganized Mormons, through one of its champions, Mr. W. W. Blair, as the best and safest way out of the difficulty has written that Joseph, the husband of Mary, was commanded to adopt the child Jesus as his own son. But let us take a glance at this theory a moment. The Almighty *swears* by an oath to David, (Ps. 132:11) that of the fruit of *his* loins he would raise up Christ to sit upon *his* (David's) throne, and then when the predicted time arrives for the fulfillment of *this* oath, he is so hard pushed for means to fulfill it, he is under the necessity of taking the fruit of *somebody else's* loins to accomplish that oath!! O ye wise men, ye philosophers and critics of the unerring word of God, is this characteristic of that God "who swears and changes not, to the uttermost?" Is it upon things of this kind that the salvation and everlasting life of man hangs, and is *made sure*? Is this the way, and the evidence that God changes not from age to age? Is this the evidence of the immutability of his word, to say nothing of his oath? Is this the way "he walks not in crooked ways, turns not to the right hand nor the left, "and varies not from that which he hath said?" (Mal. 3:6. James 1:17. Doc. & Cov. Sec. 2:1.)

But what was the necessity of the Lord Jesus coming into the world in any different way to that in which all the rest of mankind, his brethren, came into it? As he "was made in *all things, like unto his brethren,*" what advantage was it to him to come into it in any other way than is the

common lot of all mankind?" "Wherefore in *all things* it behooved him to be made *like unto his brethren.*" What for? Why, "that he might be a *merciful* and *faithful* high priest, in things pertaining to God. For in that he himself *hath suffered being tempted*, he is able to *succour them that are tempted.*" (Heb. 2:17, 18.) "For as much then as the children (of men) are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is the devil." "He took not on him the nature of angels." No indeed; "but he took upon him the seed of Abraham." Thus you perceive that it was not necessary for Jesus to receive tabernacle in some mysterious and incomprehensible way, differently from all other human beings. It was necessary that he be clothed with flesh and blood as all his brethren are that he might know the trials, the infirmities, the temptations and the sorrows that beset mankind in their efforts to follow him in the way of life everlasting; for having suffered all these things himself he knows how to feel for and succour his brethren; so then "we have not a high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was *in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.*" (see Heb. 2:14-18. 4:15.)

 Moses said: "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren *like unto me.*" Peter says this refers to the Lord Jesus. So does Stephen. (Acts 3:22. 7:37.) According to Prof. Grubbs, Peter and Stephen and Paul, and all those mentioned above, were very irreverent for putting Moses and Melchizedec "on a par with the one divine and *alone* High Priest of the new economy."

"But what shall we do," says one,

"with the account of Jesus birth as written in Math. 1:18?" We can only reply that it cannot be reconciled with the oath and promises of God to David, and the united testimonies of the many persons referred to above.

Many prophets have testified beforehand no doubt, of the birth, ministry, persecution, crucifixion, resurrection and glorification of Jesus Christ, but none of them have ever predicted that he would be a fatherless Messiah. Solitary and alone stands out this one passage, against this array of the strongest facts and testimonies.

Mr. Strang pronounced it a pious forgery of the fourth century, originating in the demi-godism of Heathen Mythology. There is self-evidently something wrong about it, as whoever was the author of it, has dragged in a prophecy in support of it, from the 7th chapter of Isaiah, that has no reference to Christ or his time of life whatever, but was given as a sign to Ahaz, King of Judah, and was fulfilled in the latter's time of life as anyone may see for himself who will read the chapter with ordinary care.

But the professor disclaims that Moses was a priest of any kind. Yet he (Moses) prophesies that the Messiah should be *a prophet like unto him*. If Moses was no priest of any kind, then of course, if Christ was to be like him, Christ was no priest. But let us see. Moses was a prophet of the most High God, so was the Lord Jesus. Moses was a great king. (Deut. 33:5.) So was the Lord Jesus. Moses was a Lawgiver. Was not Jesus a lawgiver also? God did great miracles by Moses, and He did the same by the Lord Jesus. Jesus was made a *mediator*, an *advocate* and an *intercessor* between God and man and Moses in his day, was also an advocate, a mediator and an intercessor for all Israel

in the presence of God and more than once saved them from being destroyed. (Exod. 32:30.) Moses talked face to face with God, as a man with his friend. Jesus did also. Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after. The same was true of the Saviour; only that Moses sinned in some things, but Jesus sinned in nothing. From the authority placed upon Jesus, all his ministers were made in his day for said he: "ye have not chosen me but I have chosen you, and ordained you," &c. (John 15:16.) And again "As my father hath sent me even so send I you." (John 20:21.)

Moses also was first made "a ruler and a deliverer by the hand of the angel that appeared to him in the bush," (Acts 7:35) and by virtue of this authority and power he made all the other officers in Israel in his day. (Exod. 18:25). Jesus was a great high priest, made by "the right hand of God," (Acts 2:33, 5:31) and with all these points of similarity between the two, we are told that Moses was no priest of any kind! It is contrary to all reason, and all scripture and precedent, that God commanded a man to anoint and consecrate other men to be priests, when he was himself a priest of no kind. Whoever will read the twenty-ninth chapter of Exodus will see that Moses had to offer sacrifices for the purifying of Aaron and his sons, before they could be anointed to the priest's office, and this done, Moses was commanded to "anoint and consecrate them," so "that they might minister unto God in the priest's office."

It is fair to say, that if a man is once made a mighty prophet, such as Moses, Samuel, Elijah and others of that type were, that he must of necessity be a

great high priest himself; because these are the persons who anoint, consecrate and make all other high priests, and all other officers in the church of God, in their day and generation. If merely offering sacrifices to God is evidence that a man is a high priest, why then all the holy prophets were high priests; for Noah offered sacrifice; Abraham, Isaac and Jacob offered sacrifice; Moses offered sacrifice; and Samuel and many others offered sacrifice; and aside from all this, whoever is an elder in the church of God, is a priest, but all priests are not alike in their calling and all priests do not offer sacrifices.

What an idea it is that Aaron and his sons could make atonement for the sins of the people, as priests, but Moses could not!

“Ye have sinned a *great sin*,” said Moses to Israel, in relation to the worship of the golden calf, “and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin.” (Exod. 32:30)

Why say “peradventure” here? Because idolatry was a deadly offense, and it was a pretty hard matter to make an atonement for that people at that time. (Deut. 13:12-18.) “There is a sin unto death, I do not say that ye shall pray for it.” (1st John 5:16)

In fine Moses offered sacrifices, built altars, (Exod. 17:15, Exod. 24:3 to 8) sprinkled the blood of the offering upon the altar and upon the people saying, “Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.” (Lev. 8:13 to 29. Heb. 9:19 to 21.) So we regard Moses as a priest of the most High God, as was Melchizedec, and that this order of priesthood was after the order of that held by the son of God. (Heb. 7:3.) But every man in his proper place and standing, Jesus

Christ first of all, and the chief captain of our salvation,—“the first, and the last.”

The Prof. thinks we are very ignorant in regard to the word “*ordain*.” I have made no pretensions to great learning, but I think that 60 or 70 years study, meditation and reflection upon the word of God, not to make a living out of it, but for the mere pleasure and life growing out of a clear understanding of it, ought to have taught me at least *something* about it. I can’t but think that when Moses laid his hands upon Joshua (Num. 27:15 to 23) by the command of God, to make him a leader and commander of the people, that that laying on his hands was an ordination to that office. Moreover when he was commanded to take Aaron and his sons and anoint and consecrate them with holy oil that they “might minister to him in the priest’s office,” I can’t but think that *that* was an ordination to *that* office. And again when Samuel was commanded to anoint Saul and he poured out the oil upon his head, in order to make him king, I can’t but think that the anointing was an ordination to that office. Again when Samuel was sent to anoint David to fill Saul’s place and God said, “arise, anoint him for this is he,” was not this anointing an ordination to fill the kingly office? (see 1st Sam. 10:6 to 12. Chap. 16:12 to 14.) And when we see each one of David’s successors anointed under the hands of some prophet of God, or some other high officer in his church, what conclusion can I arrive at than that these anointings were all so many ordinations to the kingly office? God speaks to Elijah saying, “Go, return on thy way to the wilderness of Damascus and when thou comest anoint Hazael to be king over Syria, and Jehu over Israel, and Elisha to be prophet in his

(Elijah's) room. What am I, or any other thinking man, to understand by these anointings only that they were so many ordinations to those offices? All these anointings and callings come, you perceive, through the greater to the lesser, in harmony with the saying: "Without all contradiction the lesser is blessed of the better," or the greater. (Heb. 7:7:)

All these callings have all had a very plain and literal meaning, but when we come to the New Testament, what mist and mystery there is thrown about the ordinations mentioned there by modern Christians, whereas the general principle of calling and ordaining both the greater and the lesser officers in the church in that dispensation was just the same, being conferred under the hands and voice of the greater upon the lesser officers. First, Jesus himself comes with the claim that the spirit of the Lord God was upon him because He (God) had anointed him to preach glad tidings (the gospel) unto the meek, to bind up the broken hearted, &c., and said this day is *this* scripture fulfilled in your ears. (Luke 4:16-21.) Could he not preach glad tidings unto the meek and to all those others without being anointed for that purpose? It seems he could not, since he was made in all things like unto his brethren, he had to submit to the same order of things as they had. So as in the case of Moses with Aaron and his sons, who were required to be anointed by Moses in order that they might minister to God in the priest's office, we see Jesus soon after *his* anointing, calling unto him twelve men and ordaining them that he might send them forth to preach and minister in the gospel. (Mark 3:14, 15.) Why not send them forth to preach without ordination?

Because it would be contrary to the

law and order of heaven to do so. One of these officers fell, and it was necessary that another be called and *ordained* to stand in his stead. (Acts 1:18-26) Were there any of these twelve anointed? They were if the Scriptures tell the truth. "Now he that establisheth us with you, and hath *anointed us* is God, who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest of the spirit in our hearts." (1st Cor. 1:21, 22.) "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any (unauthorized) man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things and is truth and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." (1st John 2:24.)

This language must of course have reference to the inspiration that follows the ordination of a true minister of God. It can refer to nothing else, than the official teaching of the Apostle John himself. After the twelve were sent out there were other seventy *appointed* and sent out, and they returned and reported great wonders done in the name of Jesus, that is by the authority given them to act in his name. For if they were not lawfully clothed with authority to act in his name, they would be simply impostors and usurpers. (Luke 10:1, 17.) Then the apostles ordained elders in every city, that is wherever they had converted souls to the faith of Jesus. (Acts 14:23.) So Titus was required by Paul to set in order things that were wanting "and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." (Titus 1:6.) So too we read of a quorum of evangelists whose number was seven, and of which Phillip was one of that seven. (Acts 21:8.) They were apostles of a lesser grade and subject to the twelve apostles.

I have here endeavored to set forth

some of the quorums or classes of officers in the Apostolic church and the manner of inducting them into those various offices, which so far as the very limited account we have of them in the Bible is concerned, is the same in both Old and New Testaments. We have no account of the manner in which Elijah was made a prophet; nor have we such an account of how different other prophets and patriarchs and kings were ordained and set apart to those offices; but the fact that God commanded Elijah to anoint Elisha to stand in his (Elijah's) room, is a pretty strong argument that Elijah was himself ordained; and the numerous other examples we have of such men being so anointed it is justly to be presumed that God's law requires that all the greater officers in God's church be so called, and so anointed and ordained. Why not then Moses be ordained according to this rule? What is there unreasonable about his being ordained under the hands and voice of an angel of God? How else could he become possessed of the mighty power and wisdom and knowledge of God, which he possessed? And if Joshua was full of the spirit of wisdom because Moses "laid his hands upon him"; if the spirit of God came upon Saul and David from the very day of their anointing, and if the spirit of the Lord God of Israel came even upon the Lord Jesus, because he (God) had anointed *him*, what is there unreasonable about the belief that all the holy prophets of God since the world began received the prophetic office and gifts by ordination and anointing by holy messengers from heaven? If every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men, why should one be anointed and ordained and another not? (Deut. 34:9. 1st Sam. 10:1 to 11. Chap. 16:1 to 14. Luke 4:19.) "Wherefore I put

thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." (2d Tim. 1:6. 1st Tim. 4:14.)

But we are very gravely told that in the Apostolic church there was no priests of any kind, except the one great High Priest, Jesus, anointed. If John the Baptist was not a priest in the church of God, how came he to baptize Jesus, and a host of others of the house of Israel? We are told, Acts 6:7, that a *great company of the priests were obedient unto the faith*" If it be true that Jesus was to sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and should purify the sons of Levi and purge them as gold and silver that they might offer an offering unto the Lord in righteousness, is that an argument that they were not necessary in the church of God? (Mal. 3:1, 2 and 3. Math. 11:10.)

Has Prof. Grubbs never learned that it was Jesus' perfection in keeping all the laws, commandments, Sabbaths and ordinances of the Almighty to perfection that made him as a sacrifice wholly acceptable to God as a lamb without blemish? Did he therefore not keep the feast of the passover, and unleavened bread, the feast of First-fruits or Pentecost, and were there not sacrifices appointed to each one of these feasts? These feasts are perpetual, to be observed "throughout all generations," and the priesthood of Aaron and his sons is also perpetual throughout their generations, and as offerings were to be offered on these feast days, is it an unreasonable thing to suppose that the sons of Aaron and Levi were there to offer them? Did this great company of the priests forfeit their everlasting right to the priesthood by becoming obedient to the faith? A part of Moses' blessing upon the tribe of Levi was that, they

should teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law, &c. "Perfection does not come by the Levitical priesthood;" but is that an argument that their priesthood and its teachings should not exist? Perfection in the sciences does not come by the common school teachers, but then they do a good deal towards fitting the youth of the countries for entry upon the road to higher and more perfect attainments. If a man knows nothing about the everlasting principles of right and wrong, as contained in the law and commandments of God, he is mighty poorly fitted for perfection in the things of God! "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they (the people) should seek the law at his mouth."

There was a law given to Israel "*that was NOT GOOD.*" And why? Simply because they would not regard the law that *was good*; and by which they might live. We are told numerous times that these first laws were a law of life; but the other laws were a law that produced moral death. Peter says this law was something that "either we nor our fathers were able to bear." And Paul says it was *added*, that is, it was added to the first laws, statutes, Sabbaths and judgments which God gave in the first place, which were laws of life, and that these added laws were to remain in force until the seed should come to whom the promise was made;" that is Jesus Christ. And Paul tells us that this added law was their schoolmaster *to bring them to Christ*, but when faith came, that is, faith in Christ, they were no longer under that schoolmaster. (Ezek. 20:10 to 25, notice particularly the 24 and 25 verses. Acts 15:5-31, specially verse 10. Gal. 3:24, 25.)

But to say that the great moral law, the ten commandments, and all the

great, grand and wise laws, statutes and judgments, Sabbaths and ordinances growing out of those commandments was such a great burden, that neither the apostles nor their fathers were able to bear them, is something, which if true, that at once would stamp the whole house of Israel as a nation of thieves and robbers, adulterers, murderers, idolators, Sabbath breakers, covetous and utterly lawless prophets, patriarchs and all. For what crime is there that all these commandments do not forbid? A thinking man can only stand aghast at the atrocity and monstrosity of such an idea!

One would think, to hear the professors denounce Joseph Smith as "a presumptuous and daring impostor," that their divided and contradictory systems of religion, had been, like the Ten Commandments thundered from heaven, just a little while ago and that it were sacrilege to even question anything about them; and all would be likely to get the impression that they had read every word of the Book of Mormon and found it all wickedness from cover to cover and that nothing on earth were more easily proved false. While the truth is, that few of them ever read a dozen pages of the Book of Mormon, or the inspired translation of the Bible, in their lives, and could not prove a single passage in either work false to save themselves from everlasting perdition.

Finally Friend R. B. Neal, it is not always the wisest or safest to pronounce a one-sided argument "the end of controversy." We can always be better judges by waiting for both sides to be heard. Let Prof. Grubbs show us plainly how Jesus held the right to the Messiahship, in the Lineage of David, if Joseph, the husband of Mary, were not his father according to the flesh.

Truly,

WINGFIELD WATSON.

